Remarks/Arguments

The Examiner is thanked for the courteous telephone interview conducted January 29, 2008. The Examiner expressed the belief, subject to further searching, that claims 10 – 12 would be allowable.

As an initial matter, th Examiner's attention is drawn to U.S. Patent Nos. 7, 201,953 and 6,817,630 by the same inventors, the latter patent having been prosecuted by Examiner Fridie Jr.

The specification has been corrected to correct an obvious typographical error. Claims 7 – 9 have been canceled. New claims 10 – 12 have been added in which the multiple layer identity card is claimed as a product by process.

Respectfully, applicants submit that claims 10 – 12 should not be rejected over Krasner in view of Krinski et al. or over Krasner in view of Takeuchi et al.

In the last office action the Examiner considered the new limitation "in solid insoluble form in the coating such as to cause friction" to be just "a recitation with respect to the manner in which the claimed apparatus (*sic – additive*) is intended to be employed". However, this is obviously a misinterpretation. The new claims have substantive limitations and are distinctly different from Krinski et al. who describes a silicate containing adhesive with very different properties. The silicate according to Krinski et al. is neither solid nor insoluble. Therefore the silicate can not cause friction.

This distinction is emphasized by the new claims, which are product by process claims. In this regard, the parent application claiming the process for the production of the identity card was granted by the same Examiner as US 6,817,630.

This is a significant distinction because Krinski et al. require a viscosity increasing additive, such as their soy polysaccharide, to lower the flowability of the adhesive The differences between what Krinski et al. require and what is required by the present invention have been described in detail in responses to prior office actions, but apparently, for reasons not fully understood by applicant, have been held by the Examiner to be inconsequential. As previously explained, there is a fundamental difference between a friction increasing additive and a viscosity increasing additive. Friction and viscosity are different physical phenomena. Sand in an adhesive causes friction between adjacent layers. A viscosity increasing additive, such as the soy polysaccharide taught by Krinski et al., lowers the flowability of the adhesive. However, when in the lamination process the temperature is increased, a high viscosity will not help because viscosity lowers (flowability increases) with rising temperature. On the other hand, friction caused by sand is not influenced by temperature. It is just as in an engine: sand in the oil will cause friction and may destroy the engine whereas a viscosity increasing additive in the oil improves the lubricating effect at higher temperatures. The key function of the friction increasing additive Z according to the present invention is to avoid the shifting of the adhesive coating relative to the printed layer sandwiched therebetween; see section [0011] of the published application. Such shift or drift causes the text to become blurred and to loose its in contours. In order to avoid this effect, the adhesive layer contains a solid, friction causing material, one of the materials mentioned in the specification being sand, see section [0014], last sentence.

Therefore, whatever Krinski et al. say about silicate or what Takeuchi et al. say about talcum and calcium carbonate, there is no more reason to substitute Krinski et al.'s soy polysaccharide with a silicate, talcum or carbonate than to simply pick those ingredients out of a catalog of any of thousands of other additives. Simply, the only basis for selecting silicate, talcum or carbonate is the applicant's specification.

Moreover, neither Kranser nor Krinski et at. deal with multiple layer identity cards of plastic. Kranser describes a mountable plate, especially a name plate while Krinski et al. describe an adhesive which is suitable for the production of paper products. Since Kranser does not mention a printed layer the problem of undesired displacement of the adhesive coatings including the printed layer does not arise according to Kranser. Therefore there is no incentive for the skilled person to look for a solution of this problem.

Krineki et al. do not propose a solution for the problem described since an aqueous solution of alkaline metal silicates is used which simply can not increase friction. The only document dealing with credit cards and the like is Takeuchi et at However, Takeuchi et al. do not give any hint to use a friction increasing additive in the adhesive coating. Calcium carbonate or talc are merely used by Takeuchi et at as fillers In order to make the fragile layer even more fragile. This purpose is totally different from the purpose according to the invention. Therefore there is no basis at all to find the specific product of the claims to be obvious.

Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-3881, under Order No. 7004-102N1. If an extension of time is required please consider this a petition and charge any additional fees which may be required to deposit account No. 50-3881. A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Dated: February 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By____________________
Robert Berliner

Registration No.: 20,121

BERLINER & ASSOCIATES
555 West Fifth Street, 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 533-4171
(213)533-4174
Attorney for Applicant